



Government
Transparency
Institute

National and regional annual aggregate statistics of public procurement spending and corruption risk indicators

A data export based on above EU threshold public
tenders (2011-2025)

Version 2026/03

March 2026, Budapest, Hungary

If you wish to use this dataset, you are kindly requested to use the following citation:

Government Transparency Institute (2026) National and regional annual aggregate statistics of public procurement spending and corruption risk indicators. A data export based on above EU threshold public tenders (2011-2025), Budapest: Government Transparency Institute. Version 2026/03. Link: <https://www.govtransparency.eu/national-and-regional-annual-aggregated-public-procurement-data-TED-2011-2025-version-202603/>

Acknowledgement: This dataset export builds on risk indicators developed as part of the FALCON project, funded by the European Union's Horizon Europe programme (Grant Agreement No. 101121281). Views and opinions expressed are those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the European Research Executive Agency.



Introduction

The Government Transparency Institute (GTI) is a non-partisan research consultancy founded in Budapest in 2015, dedicated to researching and advocating good governance. GTI has participated in several academic and policy-focused projects throughout the last decade, with the aim of understanding tendering practices across the globe. It has published several structured datasets on public procurement tenders and maintains opentender.eu, a uniquely large-scale repository of public contracts. This [data publication](#) provides aggregate indicators of procurement competition and corruption risks describing public tendering outcomes across European countries (EU-27 and Iceland, Norway, Switzerland) based on above EU-threshold public contracts.

The source data comprises publicly available above EU-threshold tenders published on Tenders Electronic Daily (TED). A high-level explanation of the general data processing steps can be found in the Government Transparency Institute (2025) report.¹ While GTI aims to collect and process each publication type as accurately as possible, due to the nature of such large datasets, and especially the shortcomings of the source data publications, the data is not error-free.²

Data preparation before aggregation

To create the final export, we filter out several lots (and bids) from the processed TED dataset, so that we are left only with those that can most likely be regarded as legitimate awarded contracts. First, we remove lots without buyer or bidder name. Second, we remove losing bids. Third, we remove cancelled tenders and lots.³ Fourth, as we aim to keep above EU-threshold contracts only, we also remove tenders with less than EUR 135,000 value. Fifth, we also remove markets (as defined by 3-digit CPV code and NUTS code pairs) with fewer than five distinct suppliers.

Using EUR 135,000 is a rough estimation of the official minimum threshold for mandatory TED publication. Voluntary publication below this threshold varies between countries, hence we exclude small tenders to avoid bias due to publication differences – for example, smaller tenders have often higher risks due to more relaxed procedural rules, hence more voluntary publication would inflate risks of regions with more voluntary publication. Note, that the applicable mandatory thresholds vary by year, buyer type, product type, and often not traceable in the source data, hence while this EUR 135,000 threshold is a simplified rule, it still tackles a significant share of selection bias.

For the regional level exports, we use the most detailed NUTS level that can be assigned to a contract. NUTS codes were cleaned and standardized across procurement data to maximize the number of contracts assignable to specific regions, enabling more accurate cross-regional comparisons. Postcodes, city names, and country codes were cleaned for consistency – removing extraneous characters, standardizing formats – and aligned with Eurostat's correspondence tables linking postcodes to NUTS3 codes across four nomenclature versions (2010, 2013, 2016, 2021). This export uses the 2021 NUTS nomenclature. Special handling was applied for countries with known data quality issues, notably Ireland, where a manually curated city-to-NUTS3 mapping was built from Eurostat's

¹ Government Transparency Institute (2025) Public procurement data processing (Version 1.0). GTI-R/2025:06. Budapest: Government Transparency Institute. <https://www.govtransparency.eu/government-transparency-institute-2025-public-procurement-data-processing-version-1-0/>

² For example, in case of several tenders the official publications are not filled out correctly, prices are missing or erroneous, winning supplier names are missing or using abbreviations, etc. As a result, some values (e.g. the sum of contract values or the number of contracts) can fluctuate significantly between years.

³ Cancellations are identified based on the availability of a cancellation date or a cancellation reason.

local administrative unit data. Missing NUTS3 codes were imputed by assigning the most frequent NUTS3 code observed within each city (where that code accounted for at least 90% of observations), and single-region countries like Cyprus and Luxembourg were filled directly. As a result, all contracts have either a standardized original or an imputed NUTS code, with some remaining with missing values that could not be assigned.

In terms of framework tenders and dynamic purchasing systems, we keep the first-stage awards, i.e. those contracts that are disclosed in the first contract award document. This is a likely overestimation of effective awarded contracts, as framework agreements can be awarded in the first-stage, that never actually materialise in effective second-stage contracts. However, as the vast majority of European countries do not systematically publish the second-stage framework contracts, a cross-country comparison is less biased when the aggregations are based on the cross-country available first-stage awards.

The corruption risk indicators included in the publication are based on prior GTI research.⁴ The corruption risk framework starts from a simple premise: for procurement corruption to work, contracts must be steered to favoured firms, which requires circumventing rules designed to ensure open competition – and those circumventions leave observable traces in administrative data. Single bidding (only one firm bidding on a competitive market) represents the simplest sign of restricted competition. Other indicators capture the procedural manipulations that produce that outcome: not publishing calls for tenders, using non-open procedures, or awarding companies registered in financially secretive jurisdictions. Each indicator of this data publication was validated by testing whether it statistically predicts single bidding after controlling for market structure and contract characteristics.⁵ The key insight is that the approach does not observe corruption directly but measures the degree to which procurement processes deviate from competitive norms in ways consistently associated with corrupt rent extraction.

Aggregation and export

The aggregated exports are published in a country-year and a region-year level dataset (the two resulting data files are the following:

- TED_aggregated_national_data_2011_2025,
- TED_aggregated_regional_data_2011_2025

The variables that are averaged at the country- and region-year levels are summarised in Table 1.

⁴ Fazekas M, Kocsis G. Uncovering High-Level Corruption: Cross-National Objective Corruption Risk Indicators Using Public Procurement Data. *British Journal of Political Science*. 2020;50(1):155-164. doi:10.1017/S0007123417000461

⁵ The indicators were re-validated within the FALCON project – see: Abdou, A., Katona, E., Kofran, D., Poltoratskaya, V., Toth, B., Vajda, D., Costa, J., Anzellotti, E., Nistotskaya, M., Wittberg, E., Śnieżko, S., & Paternoster, C. (2024). *Comprehensive list and definitions of corruption risk indicators* (Deliverable D2.2). FALCON Project (Grant Agreement No. 101121281), Horizon Europe. https://www.falcon-horizon.eu/wp-content/uploads/sites/6/2025/06/FALCON_D2.2_Comprehensive-list-and-definitions-of-corruption-risk-indicators_public.pdf



TABLE 1. VARIABLE DESCRIPTIONS

Variable name	Description
buyer_country	Country of the buyer. ISO encoded.
buyer_nuts	NUTS region (0/1/2/3) of the buyer.
tender_year	Year in which a tender took place.
contracts_number	Number of unique contracts in the given country-year group.
contracts_value	Total contract value in a given country/region-year group.
avg_corr_single_bid	Share of contracts awarded after receiving only a single bid – based on contracts with information on the number of bids.
avg_corr_nocall	Share of contracts with a "no published call for tender" risk indicator. A tender is considered to have "no call for tender" risk based on two conditions: i) the tender has no related prior information notice or contract notice and ii) the buyer country is among the countries where no call for tender is a risk factor, which means that the likelihood of a single bidding tendering outcome is significantly more likely for contracts awarded without a publicly available Call for Tenders document – see Table 2
avg_corr_procedure_type	Share of contracts with "non-open procedure" risk indicator. Whether a procedure is considered non-open depends on procedure type as well as its relationship with single bidding. A procedure is only considered to be a risk factor in countries where it is related to a higher probability of single bidding. The indicator can have a value of 0, 0.5 or 1 depending on the relationship's strength between a certain procedure type and the likelihood of single bidding in a given country. Please refer to the GTI_non_open_procedure_table.csv sheet for country-procedure type pairs. – see Table 3
avg_corr_tax_haven	Share of contracts with "tax haven" red flag. A contract has a "tax haven" risk based on two conditions: i) the buyer and the supplier are from different countries and ii) supplier country was classified as tax haven based on the Financial Secrecy Index (https://www.financialsecrecyindex.com/en/). The indicator represents the share of suppliers registered in a tax haven country relative to all contracts won by supplier registered at a foreign address. – see Table 2
foreign_supplier_contracts_number	Number of contracts won by a supplier that is registered at a foreign address.



TABLE 2. NO CALL FOR TENDER AND TAX HAVEN INDICATOR AVAILABILITY BY COUNTRY

Country	No call for tender	Tax haven
AT	Yes	Yes
BE	Yes	No
BG	Yes	Yes
CH	Yes	No
CY	No	No
CZ	Yes	Yes
DE	Yes	No
DK	Yes	No
EE	Yes	No
EL	Yes	No
ES	No	No
FI	Yes	No
FR	Yes	Yes
HR	No	Yes
HU	Yes	Yes
IE	Yes	No
IS	Yes	No
IT	No	No
LT	Yes	Yes
LU	No	No
LV	Yes	No
MT	Yes	No
NL	Yes	No
NO	Yes	No
PL	Yes	No
PT	Yes	No
RO	No	No
SE	Yes	No
SI	Yes	Yes
SK	Yes	Yes
UK	Yes	No

TABLE 3. PROCEDURE TYPE BASED RISK INDICATORS⁶

Country	Negotiated with publication	Restricted	Outright award	Competitive dialog	Negotiated without publication	Open	Design contest	Minitender	DPS purchase	Approaching bidders	Public contest	Negotiated	Innovation partnership	Concession	Other
AT	Yes (0.5)	No	No	No	Yes (1)	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
BE	No	Yes (0.5)	Yes (1)	No	Yes (1)	No	No	No	No	No	No	Yes (0.5)	No	No	No
BG	No	Yes (1)	No	No	Yes (1)	No	No	No	No	No	No	Yes (1)	No	No	No
CH	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
CY	No	No	No	No	Yes (1)	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
CZ	No	No	No	No	Yes (1)	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
DE	Yes (0.5)	Yes (0.5)	Yes (1)	No	Yes (1)	No	No	No	No	No	No	Yes (0.5)	No	No	Yes (0.5)
DK	Yes (0.5)	No	Yes (1)	No	Yes (1)	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
EE	No	No	No	No	Yes (1)	No	No	No	No	No	No	Yes (1)	No	No	No
EL	No	No	No	No	Yes (1)	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	Yes (1)
ES	Yes (1)	Yes (1)	No	No	Yes (1)	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
FI	Yes (0.5)	No	No	No	Yes (1)	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
FR	No	No	No	No	Yes (1)	No	No	No	No	No	No	Yes (1)	No	No	No
HR	No	No	No	No	Yes (1)	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
HU	Yes (0.5)	Yes (1)	No	No	Yes (1)	No	No	No	No	No	No	Yes (0.5)	No	No	No
IE	Yes (1)	No	No	Yes (1)	Yes (1)	No	No	No	No	No	No	Yes (1)	No	No	No
IS	No	Yes (1)	No	Yes (1)	Yes (1)	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
IT	Yes (0.5)	Yes (0.5)	Yes (1)	Yes (0.5)	Yes (1)	No	No	Yes (1)	Yes (0.5)	No	No	Yes (0.5)	Yes (0.5)	No	Yes (0.5)
LT	No	No	No	No	Yes (1)	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
LU	No	No	No	No	Yes (1)	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
LV	No	No	No	No	Yes (1)	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
MT	No	Yes (1)	No	No	Yes (1)	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
NL	No	No	Yes (1)	No	Yes (1)	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
NO	No	No	No	No	Yes (1)	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	Yes (0.5)
PL	Yes (1)	Yes (0.5)	Yes (1)	No	Yes (1)	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	Yes (0.5)
PT	No	Yes (0.5)	Yes (1)	No	Yes (1)	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	Yes (1)
RO	Yes (1)	Yes (1)	No	No	Yes (1)	No	No	No	No	No	No	Yes (1)	No	No	No
SE	No	No	Yes (1)	No	Yes (0.5)	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	Yes (0.5)
SI	Yes (1)	No	No	Yes (1)	Yes (1)	No	No	No	No	No	No	Yes (1)	No	No	No
SK	Yes (1)	No	No	No	Yes (1)	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No

⁶ 0.5 refers to moderate, 1 refers to high procedure type risks, which means that they are statistically significantly related to higher likelihood of single-bidding outcomes.